

quickly and effectively. Too many people lose sight of the fact that the real issue here is how to help children and newcomers who do not know English and who need to assimilate.

Let us not forget Ernesto Ortiz and his children, Bilga Abramova and other new Americans like them. Mr. Speaker, this is not just an abstract public policy issue; bilingual education and our national language policies have real world consequences. When our policies fail, the failures have names and faces attached to them. When our policies serve to divide rather than unite us, the rips appear in the very fabric of the American Nation.

The following description of bilingual education comes from US News and World Report: "along with crumbling classrooms and violence in the hallways, bilingual education has emerged as one of the dark spots on the grim tableau of American public education. Today, the program has mushroomed into a \$10 billion-a-year bureaucracy that not only cannot promise that students will learn English but may actually do some children more harm than good."

Mr. Speaker, this should be bilingual education's epitaph. I urge all of my colleagues to see the writing on the wall. Bilingual education has had its time to prove its effectiveness; 28 years is long enough to see if this approach works. These programs were created with good intentions, I am sure. However, after almost three decades and billions of dollars, we must recognize the painful truth that bilingual education does not work.

CONGRESS PLAYING POLITICAL CHICKEN WITH NATION'S CREDIT RATING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to speak about something else, but I ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] to stay, because I was very fascinated by what he was saying, and he only had the 5 minutes. The gentleman is saying that his committee is going to mark up this megabill that is going to cost billions of dollars, and really it is going to be basically for the fat-cat farmers?

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentlewoman will yield, yes, basically the wealthy, the farmer with a lot of acreage producing a lot of crops will benefit from it.

To give another example, down in cotton country, in west Texas and New Mexico and other places where upland cotton is grown, if they gave a good year, and it looks like next year is going to be a good year, if they follow the programs, they could make, say, half a million dollars in selling their cotton. At the same time, a father and two sons, or a father with his two brothers, as long as they have three entities, they can get \$40,000 each. They will get that whether they farm or not.

If they make half a million dollars, they are still going to get \$120,000 from the Government. If they do not farm at all, they decide, "Well, we are going to

quit farming, we are going to let the land stay idle. Let us go down south for a while," they get \$120,000. That is right. They do not have to farm at all.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is absolutely astounding. They get paid whether they decide to work or not?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this is a welfare program that makes welfare look tough.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, it makes AFDC and food stamps and everything so little and so pike. And yet they on that side made a big to-do on how we have to save all of this money, getting back to kids eating, to school lunches, and then giving big farmers, many of which have their own airplanes and their own big cars and Mercedes and make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, they are going to give them money.

Like I said before, in the chairman's own district, it has been estimated that in the chairman's own district in western Kansas, he has 85 percent of his wheat farmers in the program. So they will, each one of them will get on the average, estimated on the average, \$30,000 a year, even if they do not farm. If they do, and next year wheat prices are looking real good, and they make a \$100,000, they still are going to make that \$30,000.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. They do not have to give it back?

Mr. VOLKMER. No, no, it is guaranteed.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for staying. I know the gentleman is very busy.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman is saying is classic about what is going on around here. This place is basically shut down. They throw out a bill, and we find out all of these special interests here in it. Here we are, playing political chicken with the credit rating of this Nation. This is outrageous.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, it is the same thing that happened in the 100 days. Remember, if we were on the committee, we got the bill that morning. Guess what, I got the final version of their bill this morning, and we are going to mark it up at 2 o'clock.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. He is obviously a speed reader, if he got through it that fast, and the rest of us will never see it.

Mr. Speaker, it will be like the committee that I am on that came to the floor last week. The Committee on National Security got notice that there were two copies of the bill, and we could go in the morning and could go to the room where the two copies of the bill were located. We could spend our time reading the bill, of course, this thick. Get a clue.

So I must say, this is really very troubling as to what is going on here

and how stuff is ramrodded through, and we are getting paid, but we are doing nothing. We are becoming like the farmers, I guess. We get paid whether we legislate or not or whether we do anything realistic or not. Here we are, this is great. I guess we are changing our programs so that everybody else gets to be like Members of Congress.

This is a light month; February, we are hardly here. But the tragedy is, this is a very serious month. This is the month when the birthdays of Washington and Lincoln come up. I wonder what they must be thinking that we are celebrating their birthday in February by pushing this country to the brink of shoving its credit rating right off the side.

Mr. Speaker, I think of every American family sitting around their kitchen table, and one of the things they are terribly worried about is obviously their credit rating. In America, if one's credit rating goes sour, they are going to have a very tough life. If our country's credit rating goes sour, we are going to look like fools on this planet.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is really time that we all come and have some debates about those issues. We owe that to the people sitting around the kitchen table dealing with those issues in their own family budgets. For crying out loud, we are paid to deal with this Nation's budget. We are now 5 months into the fiscal year, and we have not done it. It is about time we get on with it.

OPPOSE FRANCE'S NUCLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I urge your support for a letter which will be delivered to French President Jacques Chirac when he arrives in Washington this week.

Our letter expresses our support for France's decision to end its recent series of nuclear testing, as well as our concern about the long-term damage caused by the tests in the first place.

Our letter is simple and to the point: while we oppose France's series of nuclear tests that began this past September, we ask that the French Government permanently close its testing facilities and immediately begin a comprehensive cleanup operation.

France's decision to conduct a series of tests prior to enacting a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty is hypocritical and lacks the sound judgment of a country that aspires to world leadership.

By continuing with these unlawful tests, France undermined its credibility in the world community. We are now forced to question the French Government's reliability in what they say is their commitment to eliminate nuclear weapons.

We implore France to join the United States and other nuclear powers to immediately push for, and complete negotiations, for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Much is at stake. If the nations involved do not seize this opportunity to reach agreement on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty soon, the world's best and perhaps last chance to end nuclear testing may slip through our fingers.

I hope you will join me and Congressman MARKEY in sending a message to France that the United States objects to their series of nuclear tests, and that an agreement should be reached as soon as possible on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

TEENAGE PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President launched a national campaign to reduce teenage pregnancy. Today, I am circulating a letter that will be sent to the President by the end of the week—stating the support of Members of the House of Representatives for this vital initiative.

The goal of the President's campaign is to reduce the rate of teenage pregnancy by one-third in 10 years. It is a reasonable goal. It is an achievable goal. This is a campaign that can be won and must be won. This is a campaign that all of us should be engaged in, Democrats, Republicans, and independents.

A recent report to Congress on out-of-wedlock childbearing indicates that 30 percent of all out-of-wedlock births are to teenagers, below age 20. The increase in out-of-wedlock births is alarming. Most alarming is that 30 percent of the out-of-wedlock births are to adolescents.

One objective of welfare reform, shared by both political parties, is to reduce teenage childbearing. We can not ignore the reality that most young men and women are increasingly delaying marriage until their mid-20's and beyond—but not sexual activity.

In 1960, 14 percent of young women ages 15-19 were married. By 1992, the proportion was less than 5 percent.

Because these young men and women are becoming sexually experienced at younger ages without the benefit of marriage and sex education, there are proportionally more teenagers exposed to the risk of unmarried pregnancy. In 1970, 29 percent of 15-19 year old females were sexually experienced. By 1988, that number had increased to 52 percent.

The relationship between poverty and teenage pregnancy is significant. In 1994, of all young women age 15-19, 38 percent were defined as poor or low-income. According to the report, of these, poor or low-income young women 73 percent were projected to be-

come pregnant. In 1988, 56 percent of pregnant girls ages 15-19 were from families with incomes less than \$12,000 annually. By contrast, 27 percent whose family incomes were between \$12,000-\$24,000 gave birth, and only 17 percent whose family incomes were above \$25,000 gave birth.

Reducing teenage childbearing is likely to require more than eliminating or manipulating welfare programs. The underlying causes are said to include family instability, economics, poverty, lack of education, and sexual abuse. And, sadly, the report indicates that young women and men who become teen parents have few expectations, few ties to community institutions, few adult mentors and role models, and too much spare time. Many live in communities where crime and drug use are common, where dropping out of school and chronic unemployment are even more common.

In my opinion these causes can be reduced to the lack of hope and confidence in the future by our teenagers. Our society cannot endure this human burden.

We must, therefore, implement pregnancy prevention programs that educate and support school age youths, 10-19, in high-risk situations and their family members through comprehensive social and health services with an emphasis on pregnancy prevention.

But again, Government programs alone will not properly address this serious problem of teenage pregnancy. All sectors of our communities must be engaged. In my congressional district, I have created a task force of private citizens and State and local officials to study ways that we can address this problem.

The task force has begun planning for a forum on adolescent pregnancy prevention to be held on March 16, 1996. This forum is designed to help local communities understand the problem, to engage the participation of various organizations—youth, church, civic, and public institutions—and to give visibility to successful community programs.

The President's national campaign to reduce teenage pregnancy will be a tremendous boost to those efforts.

The total cost of maternity care for an out-of-wedlock birth and the baby's first 12 months of medical care is said to be more than \$8,000, according to the North Carolina Department of Human Resources. The number of teenage pregnancies covered by Medicaid in North Carolina in a year is nearly 13,000. When that number is multiplied by \$8,506, the grand total becomes \$108,851,282. If all of these teenage mother's had been able to delay becoming pregnant until they were older and financially able to take care of a baby, those resources could have been used in other productive ways.

After the first year of life, very often these same teenagers require AFDC, food stamps, and additional Medicaid benefits for the child. Mr. Speaker, my

colleagues can do the math on these figures; however, the point is obvious.

Prevention is much better and cheaper than punishment after the fact of childbearing. And, we should not forget that teen pregnancy is also a strong predictor of a new generation of disadvantage. The equation is simple. As poverty is the most accurate predictor of teen pregnancy, teen pregnancy is a near-certain predictor of poverty.

The board membership of the national campaign is broad and bipartisan, including former Surgeon General, Dr. C. Everett Koop and former Senator Warren Rudman. It is an easy, yet important gesture to let the members of the board know, through this letter to the President, that we in the House of Representatives stand behind them. Their goal is ambitious. The situation is urgent. Each Member has an obligation to be engaged in this effort.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress convenes today in Washington, many Texans are convened in Austin, TX, to celebrate the life of Ralph W. Yarborough. Senator Yarborough, Judge Yarborough, Assistant Attorney General Yarborough, a man originally from Chandler, TX, but a man now claimed by people across our great State, is one who contributed significantly to the lives of those of us who live now in Texas.

Senator Yarborough was the only southern Senator to support the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Just as the great Senator and general, Sam Houston, once cut across the grain of popular opinion in Texas when the question was union in the 1860's, so Senator Yarborough had the courage to cut across the grain of popular opinion at the time and do what was best for the future of our State by standing up for civil rights.

Senator Yarborough is a person who served our State with incredible tenacity and incredible courage. Many Texans now will perhaps not remember his service when they take an excursion to the Guadalupe Mountains National Park, when they visit Padre Island National Seashore, when as a veteran they benefit from his work on the GI bill of rights that extended education services for veterans. But his mark is there, an immense mark with reference to legislation.

I think more than any particular legislative act, those of us who continue to participate in public service in Texas will remember the role that Ralph Yarborough made in public service in our State, in every branch of government. We remember that Ralph Yarborough symbolized concern for people, but he recognized that those